UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/532,255 | 532,255 04/21/2005 Friedrich Arnold | | 2002P01332WOUS | 8408 |
| | 7590 07/28/200 PPLIANCES CORPOR | EXAMINER | | |
| | AL PROPERTY DEPA | KOCA, HUSEYIN | | |
| 100 BOSCH BO NEW BERN, N | = = | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 3744 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 07/28/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|---------------|--|--|
| 10/532,255 | ARNOLD ET AL. | | |
| F., and in an | A 4 11 14 | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |

| | HUSEYIN KOCA | | 3744 | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover s | heet with the d | correspondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>16 June 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | LICATION IN CON | DITION FOR A | LLOWANCE. | | | | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amer eal (with appeal fee) | ndment, affidavit in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | dvisory Action, or (2) t ater than SIX MONTH b). ONLY CHECK BO | S from the mailing | g date of the final rejection | n. | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corres hortened statutory pei | ponding amount origination | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | nsion thereof (37 CF | FR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bette appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second | nsideration and/or sow); ter form for appeal becomes | earch (see NOT | E below); ducing or simplifying th | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1.2.4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.2.5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | 21. See attached No owable if submitted | in a separate, t | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | l be entered and an ex | planation of | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejectio and was not earlie | ns under appea r presented. Se | ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | s to provide a). | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | • | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: | r i O/SB/Vo) Paper | 140(5). | | | | | |
| /Cheryl J. Tyler/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3744 | /Huseyin Examiner, | Koca/ Art Unit 3744 | | | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The newly recited limitation in claim 13, "temperature sensitive element being in substantially non-insulated contact with said thermal buffer liquid" is a new issue that will require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues with respect to the rejections of claims 13, 15, 17, 19, and 27, that Jones fails to anticipate or render obvious a step of visually observing a temperature variable property of the temperature sensitive element to determine temperature conditions. In response, this limitation is not required by claims 17 and 19. With respect to claims 13, 15, and 27, Jones teaches visually observing a temperature variable property of the temperature sensitive element to determine temperature conditions (Fig. 1; Fig. 3; C-1, L-63-73; C-2, L-1-2). One can look at the item 14 in Jones to visually observe a temperature variable property of the temperature sensitive element to determine temperature conditions. With respect to arguments presented against claim 31, Examiner maintains that the shape of the temperature sensitive element does not have any criticality in regards to how the temperature sensitive element functions. The specification of this application also states that the form of the temperature sensitive element can be any shape in page 6, lines 31-32. Applicant also makes a general argument stating that the concept of having sensing device which is readily observable through a transparent wall of a container resident in a refrigerator without disturbing the contents of the container is simply not suggested by Witonsky alone or in combination with the teaching of Jones. Examiner is not clear regarding to which claim this argument is referring. Examiner believes that all the limitations in the claims have been addressed in the Final Office Action mailed on 03/17/2008.

/CJT/ SPE, AU 3744